

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Holiday Inn, Grand Junction, Colorado

August 10-11, 2005

Wednesday, August 10

7:30 a.m.: CAPITAL PROJECTS TOUR: The group toured area capital projects (Grand Valley Project Fish Passage, Grand Valley Project Fish Screen, Grand Valley Water Management Project Highline Lake Pumping Plant, Grand Valley Water Management Project Check Structure).

CONVENE MEETING: 1:45 p.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper - The agenda was modified as it appears below.
2. Approve June 2, 2005, meeting summary - Minor modifications were made to the summary. >Angela Kantola will post the revised summary to the listserver. Dave Mazour said Leslie James brought copies of her testimony to this meeting for anyone who would like them. Dave said he doesn't believe anything in the testimony is critical of the Program. Tom Iseman said he thinks Dan's concern was that the testimony seemed to implicate this Program in the status of the Basin Fund. Leslie added that her comments about the Recovery Program were the same as those she's made in previous testimony before Congress (including her testimony on the long-term funding legislation). Tom Pitts suggested that Program participants extend one another the courtesy of sharing relevant Congressional testimony with each another before it's given, when possible.
3. Draft sufficient progress review and two-year 15-Mile Reach PBO assessment - Larry Gamble asked the group if they had any comments or concerns on the draft. Tom Pitts asked how Service concluded that HUP operation was "extremely conservative" (page 9), noting that he understands that there were predictions of shortage up until late September. George said a surplus wasn't declared because Grand Valley felt they needed all the water available to complete the irrigation season; George felt that not using the quite-expensive GVWM facilities was very conservative. Brent suggested that "extremely conservative" might be over-stated, but there was definitely a conservative approach in 2004. Yet in the very severe drought of 2002, the Service was very accommodating of the irrigators. Tom Pitts suggested that it might be more appropriate for the memo to reflect that the group failed to reach consensus on HUP operations. Dave Merritt said HUP came up short in 2002 and all contracts were voided, so users tended to be conservative in 2004. Tom Pitts asked about the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 13 regarding Reclamation obligations to release water from Aspinall, noting that he understood the Blue Book (see pages 4-10 and 4-11) to set interim operating standards for Aspinall until flow recommendations were made and a revised Biological Opinion issued before Reclamation would be expected to make specific deliveries. Brent asked the Service to consider dropping that last sentence. Gary Burton said he thinks the first sentence in that paragraph is premature (or at least too strongly stated). John Shields added that the sentence is overly broad, in light of the fact that flows from Aspinall are provided to operate the Redlands fish ladder. Tom Pitts

expressed similar concern with item #8 on page 16. Tom suggested simply stating the status: flow recommendations have been completed, Reclamation is conducting NEPA compliance on Aspinall reoperation, after which the Service will issue a Biological Opinion. Al Pfister expressed concern about *when* that Biological Opinion can be completed; John Shields added that the length of time these EIS processes are taking is really the issue. With regard to item #6 on page 15, Dave Merritt affirmed that this is the 4th year the 5,412 af won't be available from Wolford Mountain Reservoir based on the shortage criteria. The District asked Reclamation for a 5,000 af contract from Ruedi in November 2003, but that contract is still pending (in Reclamation's Loveland contracting office). Dave said the District will make 1,000 af available this year from Wolford and they have ~1,200 af of unscheduled water from Ruedi this year which they've asked Reclamation to allow them to make available for fish. John Shields suggested "expedite the River District's *request*" would be a more accurate statement. John Shields made a general comment that the level of specificity in this draft sufficient progress memo should perhaps be addressed in other ways in the Program (rather than trying to do planning and reporting at this level under the umbrella of sufficient progress). (John also noted that we're considering this draft at the same time we're looking at the biennial work plan.) Tom Pitts said that it would be nice if the sufficient progress memo could be shorter, and it would be helpful to get it back on schedule, but he believes the Program needs to know the Service's concerns, so he doesn't object to the level of detail. John Shields suggested that in the past, for example, the Program Director's Update has been an important way of raising these issues before the committees. Others echoed the desire to get the sufficient progress memo completed earlier in the year. Tom Iseman encouraged the Service to be more specific with regard to status of the fish and what things they would like to see with respect to status. Tom said the >environmental groups will provide more specific comments on this draft memo. Any additional comments should be submitted to the Service no later than August 19.

4. Presentation on Basin Fund - Clayton Palmer discussed Basin Fund cash balances and management during the recent dry years. By rough estimates, Western currently expects a carry-over of \$41M into FY 06 (however, this doesn't take into account additional expenses for Glen Canyon experimentation or increases in the power market). Western is coordinating a draft management plan (which Clayton distributed) with Reclamation and consulting with their customers on the plan. Western intends to use the plan as a way to identify scenarios and inform potentially affected groups. In the 5th (worst case) scenario (no generation at Glen Canyon), Reclamation and Western would seek appropriations for the Recovery Program (this also would be considered under the 3rd and 4th scenarios). Leslie James noted that due to the timing of the appropriations cycle, it would be too late to request appropriations when the trigger is reached; therefore, something needs to be in place to provide appropriations if and when the trigger is reached. Western and Reclamation are not currently working on legislation. Leslie said that CREDA is working on drafting legislation and plans to share it with the Program. Leslie said that rate increases and reduced power deliveries have prevented the Basin Fund from falling further. Once the management plan is finalized, Clayton said Western will inform the Program what scenario they anticipate each year.

5. Schedule Implementation Committee meeting and discuss agenda items - September 9th won't work and a suitable nearby date could not be found. Delaying approval of the FY 06-07 work plan beyond mid-September would not be good, so >Management Committee members will ask their Implementation Committee members to allow the Management Committee's approval of the work plan to stand (with Committee members given until August 25 to confirm this and submit any additional comments or concerns). To schedule an Implementation Committee meeting later in September, >Angela Kantola will poll Implementation Committee members via e-mail (and copy Management Committee members) for available dates the week of September 19th and 26th.
6. Presentation on the San Juan River Program - David Campbell gave an update on the San Juan Program. Accomplishments include: stocking Colorado pikeminnow (>668,000 juveniles since 2002) and razorback sucker (only 10,850 adults and subadults since 1994; nevertheless, since 1996 razorback sucker have shown an increasing trend river wide for all life stages combined, with 116 razorback sucker collected during adult monitoring in 2004); stocked razorbacks spawning and their young surviving; river-wide declining trend in channel catfish over the last 9 years; fish access to about 36 miles of critical habitat restored; selective fish passage at Public Service Company of New Mexico weir constructed and operating; and diversion at Cudei removed and non-selective fish passage at Hogback diversion constructed. David said the San Juan Program is re-writing its Program document and long-range plan, and those will now align more closely with the Upper Basin Program.
7. Elkhead Reservoir enlargement project - Dan Birch gave an update on Elkhead construction, which began in March. Difficulties encountered in excavation and design review/approval, and resident engineering have been addressed, resulting in a budget ~\$1.5M higher than originally anticipated (still within the \$3.3M contingency), and Dan believes the project can be completed within the anticipated budget. (Note: that budget does require extending the authorization to complete capital projects.) Dan said the contractor's most recent schedule shows completion in 2006, so the reservoir should fill in 2007 with water available for fish that year. Failure of the temporary fish screen was this year's big disappointment. Design for a temporary screen for next year's runoff has been developed (cost would be ~\$185K). The District needs direction from the Management Committee by September 1 as to whether to construct the temporary screen this fall (if the Program can't provide direction by September 1, construction would be delayed and the cost would increase). The outlet tower and permanent fish screens will be in place before the 2006 spring runoff and will be used to bypass ~400cfs of spring runoff next year, which will significantly reduce the amount of water going over the spillway. Pat said the Biology Committee plans to review this year's data on nonnative fish escapement at their September 19-20 meeting. Based on cost and this year's failure, Brent said he doesn't think a temporary screen is worth the cost; he'd rather put more effort into nonnative fish control in the river. (If the cost of mechanical removal were significantly less, Brent said we could consider using capital funds because this is clearly a construction-related expense). Bob Muth agreed. Melissa countered, pointing out that the Committee seems to have accepted an \$800K resident engineering increase without question, but is hesitant to consider a \$185K fish screen. Dan emphasized that the escapement potential is less during construction than it was prior to construction, and will

be lower still when construction is completed. Since the data on nonnative fish escapement are due August 15, the Management Committee asked the >Biology Committee to have a conference call in late August to provide input that Bob Muth will use to poll the Management Committee via e-mail for a decision before September 1 on whether or not to install a temporary screen for 2006. If the decision is not to screen, then the committees should consider whether to spend additional funds (capital or annual) on more mechanical removal effort. Gary Burton suggested further investigating using the siphon to reduce the pool and nonnative fish escapement in the spring. Lori said she believes CDOW would object to this based on their draft lake management plan. John Shields asked about using the siphon as one more way of screening spring runoff (Dan said it can only screen ~40cfs). Dan invited the Committee to visit Elkhead while construction is underway.

Thursday, August 11, 2005

CONVENE 8:00 a.m.

8. Proposed integration of UCRRP and San Juan outreach materials - Debbie Felker discussed the elements of the draft proposal. John Shields suggested that we also consider joining the two web sites; and, more importantly, that we should ask the two program directors and/or the I&E Committee to develop a clear statement explaining why the two programs are separate. Tom Pitts endorsed a full-size exhibit that covers both programs. Tom asked >the program directors and Debbie to provide a revised proposal with costs and specifics to the San Juan Coordinating Committee well in advance of their November meeting. Brent Uilenberg suggested that we also consider any other areas where the two programs may be able to share resources (e.g., hatcheries and stocking). Dave Mazour asked about the range of interests represented in the San Juan Program vs. the Upper Basin (e.g., environmental groups, power, etc.). Tom Pitts and Brent responded that the environmental groups declined to participate due to ALP and the Navajo project doesn't have a power component. Western considered participating, but water users objected to another full Federal vote and Western didn't pursue membership. Dave Campbell said he thinks the proposed integration will be very helpful to the San Juan Program. The Committee endorsed the proposed integration and will await the San Juan Coordinating Committee's response to the more detailed proposal.
9. Progress on achieving FY 06 and 07 funding and legislation to extend authorization to complete capital projects - The Senate bill was introduced by Senator Allard on July 29th. To aid in preparation of letters supporting the enactment of this bill and H.R. 3153 during this session of Congress, John Shields distributed a rough draft and will soon transmit a revised draft letter for use as a "pattern" or "template" (support letters need to be drafted and ready to go so they can be sent on short notice). John said we're hoping for a hearing on this in September. Dave Mazour noted that they raised this issue on this week's legislative tour out of Steamboat Springs sponsored by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Dave said Kiel Weaver thought the hearing might be in October. Rick Axthelm asked for more information regarding the recovery goals (in light of the fact that there was public participation in their development, yet they're still a

subject of litigation). >Bob Muth will follow up on this.

10. Review of draft FY 2006-2007 Work Plan

70 Tom Pitts referred to language in this scope that seems like an ultimatum: “Future filings on the Colorado and Yampa rivers will not be pursued until the new process developed by the CDOW for the determination of instream flow needs has been accepted by the Recovery Program and CWCB and new recommendations based on that process provided.” The Program has never endorsed a specific methodology and the Biology Committee reviewed Rick Anderson’s report, but declined to accept or reject it. >Tom Blickensderfer will follow up with CWCB on this concern and ask Randy Seaholm to work with George Smith to appropriately revise and update the language.

C-9 The scope of work for Elkhead enlargement has just been faxed to the program Director’s office. >George Smith will send out the scope of work. Brent said that although we’re not showing funds for Elkhead in FY 06, if other capital funds become available this year (e.g., if \$2.8M couldn’t be obligated to a Tusher Wash contract in FY 06), they would like to make early payment on the agreed-upon Program contribution to Elkhead in FY 06.

Duchesne Tom Pitts said he understands we need a placeholder for \$18K for sediment monitoring on the Duchesne to support the biological opinion. The Committee added that. >George Smith will develop this scope of work in coordination with Terry Hickman (and also reference work being done CUWCD and the DRWG). Outyear (FY 07 and 08) costs would \$17K, with a 60% Program/40% USGS match.

135a Reclamation declined to waive the portion (\$27K) of the 2004 extraordinary Ruedi O&M repayment that wasn’t invoiced in FY 04, but is willing to allow the Program to make payments as end of year funds are available. The Committee agreed that to the extent end of year funds are available, they should go toward this cost. No funds are currently obligated in FY 06 or 07, in anticipation of available end-of-year funds in FY 05 and beyond. >Brent and Angela will close this loop with an e-mail to Brian Person.

C-6Hyd Moved to annual funds.

C-6Eas >The Program Director’s office will discuss this project with the Service and get the scope of work revised.

Bob Muth noted that nonnative fish management scopes of work may be revised somewhat based on outcome of the workshop in December. Tom Pitts said nonnative fish management now makes up 25% of the Program’s annual budget, and we will need to consider this as we address future years as the States formulate conservation plans.

C-7 >Tom Czapla will work with Vernal and Reclamation to determine if additional work on wells is needed in FY 06 (\$45K).

29d Tom Czapla has a preliminary answer on the cost of the lease of ponds from Trinidad State Junior College (which includes utilities and some tanks, as well), but >will follow-up to get the complete answer.

Duchesne sampling - Bob Muth said that Kevin Christopherson and Dave Irving agreed to look at how they might dovetail their nonnative fish sampling and other work on the Duchesne to provide needed fish community information (cost TBD) , and also to do a one-day trip to examine riffle conditions (FWS). These scopes of work should be submitted by the end of next week.

Another potential cost (capital or annual) might be additional mechanical control of nonnative fish downstream of Elkhead Reservoir in FY 06.

The Committee discussed the additional work prioritized by the Biology Committee should additional funds be available. Tom Pitts recommended not approving additional work on the priority list now, but instead waiting for >recommendations from the Program Director on the overall direction the Program should be taking. John Shields added that we would also want the Program Director to consider concerns outlined in the sufficient progress assessment. Melissa endorsed the approach of looking at the Program's overall needs, but emphasized that the Biology Committee believes the projects they recommended are important work that should be done when funds are available.

The Committee approved the FY 06-07 work plan, but did not approve additional work at this time. As discussed earlier in the meeting, >Management Committee members will ask their Implementation Committee members to allow the Management Committee's approval of the work plan to stand (with Committee members given until August 25 to confirm this and submit any additional comments or concerns). Tom Pitts expressed concern about the Service completely reducing their power revenue funds carry-over (since there's no assurance that the Service's \$700K will be included in the President's FY 07 budget); and asked that the Committee review this before FY 07. Tom Czapla noted that there could still be minor changes related to how funding is allocated among fiscal years for projects that have a fall field season with sampling in September and October, for example. >Angela Kantola will include a note in the e-mail transmitting this meeting summary that any overdue scopes of work need to be submitted by the end of next week.

11. Updates

- a. Recent Grand Canyon humpback chub population estimate - Tom Czapla discussed the FWS & AZGF reports he sent out and showed graphs of humpback chub population estimate data in the Little Colorado River (LCR). For the next Implementation Committee meeting agenda, we'll request a report from the Service on coordination of humpback chub recovery, and from Randy Peterson on

GCMRC's approach to the population estimates we requested. Bob Muth said the larger question is where the lower basin is in implementing humpback chub recovery actions in the Grand Canyon.

- b. Status of humpback chub recovery goals lawsuit - Bob Muth provided a status update.
- c. Reclamation contracting and procurement procedures - Angela Kantola recounted the June meeting among Bob Muth, Mike Ward, Melynda Roberts, Dave Speas, Mark McKinstry, and Brent Uilenberg, David Campbell, and herself to review FY 06-07 Recovery Program projects which may be subject to competition and discuss how to best integrate competition into the Program's existing work planning schedule. At the time of the meeting, only one new project was identified for competition: evaluation of Colorado pikeminnow entrainment in Yampa diversion structures (FY 07 start). Reclamation already has work underway to compete PIT tags. Angela said that some of the additional work the Biology Committee recommended for FY 06-07 also might need to be considered for competition; however, it's not clear how the competition process could be scheduled to allow work to start in a timely fashion in FY 06. Most nonnative fish management, hatchery and other facilities O&M, population estimates, and program management projects will likely be exempted from competition, though complete justifications will be needed for the majority of these projects. Draft justifications for non-competition will be provided to the Program committees for review (with a draft concurrence memo from the committees to Reclamation). (See the FY 06 budget table for an overview of the type of the projects for which non-competition justifications will be written). With regards to scheduling, when a new project is included in draft Program Guidance for which competition will be required, Reclamation can provide advance notice of an RFP with draft Program Guidance on or about February 1. Reclamation would then issue the actual RFP on or about March 17 (when final Program Guidance comes out), and require submittals within 45 days to stay in sync with the Program's end of April scope of work due date. When proposals are received as a result of an RFP, the next step would be for a TPEC to review the proposal(s) in cooperation with the coordinators (who would be part of the TPEC). Other eligible TPEC participants could include committee members who haven't submitted proposals and people outside the Program. The TPEC would select the contractor and provide the selected proposal to the committees, for their information only. This will put a much greater onus on Program committees to be sure they are satisfied with Program Guidance, because the Program will be delegating responsibility for making the selection to the TPEC. A request for information (RFI) may be used before an RFP in order to see if anyone has interest in a project. >Angela Kantola will incorporate this process into the Program's work planning process. Bob Muth expressed concern about potential conflict between this Program's very open style and the strict confidentiality required of TPEC's.
- d. Capital projects - Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation plans to award contracts on Price Stubb fish passage and the Tusher Wash screen in FY 06 with construction

to be completed in FY 07. They met with Thunder Ranch representatives in July and agreed on repairs (setback levee, etc., at a cost of ~\$200K). Pat distributed a list of all the properties in which the Program has acquired interest and his assessment of risk associated with each of those.

- e. Flaming Gorge EIS - The draft biological opinion (BO) was shared with the Management Committee earlier this week. After the final BO is received and accepted, it will take ~3 months for Reclamation to issue the final EIS and ROD. Several Committee members endorsed Tom Pitts comments on the draft BO. The Committee agreed to submit comments to Reclamation on the draft by August 19. John Shields emphasized the need to get this and the Aspinall processes completed; Tom Iseman agreed. Steve McCall said Reclamation's Regional Director is also very concerned about keeping these EIS's on schedule.
- f. Aspinall EIS process - Steve McCall said the EIS will develop a full range of alternatives for meeting the flow recommendations. They're working to develop the no-action alternative and have offered several extensions to cooperators for comments (the issue being the amount of future water development); but expect those comments by tomorrow. The hydrologists are making good progress developing the Riverware model for analyzing the alternatives. The next cooperating agency meeting September 7. Tom Iseman emphasized that the purpose and need should reflect recovery, not just avoiding jeopardy.
- g. Spring 2005 Green River floodplain research - Pat Nelson discussed his summary of the studies done this spring and distributed copies of the hydrograph. Pat said they learned a great deal about how long it takes water to reach Jensen. Five flights of aerial photos were made to quantify area of inundation (Argonne is analyzing the data). TetraTech measured inflows at selected razorback sucker nursery sites. The upstream levee breaches worked best. We also learned we could hold hatchery brood stock in cold water to prevent them from spawning too soon and hold larvae in cooler water to slow growth so they'll be the right size for entraining in the floodplain. Data are still being analyzed from the bead and larval drift and entrainment, but the beads appear to have behaved as expected. We may need to rethink the "larval decay rate" for Green River floodplain management plan, since at least quite a number of the beads made it 54 miles downstream of the spawning bar to Ouray NWR. Pat said he believes that when all the data are analyzed, we'll have learned a good deal about what's needed for razorback recovery in the Green River. Melissa said the Service caught larvae from all 3 releases down at Old Charlie Wash in their light-trap samples. Melissa also noted that the breach at the Leota site had aggraded by at least a foot. Pat said UDWR is now doing follow-up work to see if the entrained larvae survived and grew. John Shields asked if dropping the mainstem flow in smaller increments might help maintain the larvae in the sites with lateral and downstream breaches. Pat said he thinks the best solution is to have upstream breaches with flow-through. (Downstream breaches were made to prevent sites from being completely recaptured by the river and turned into side-channels, but we haven't experienced this problem with our upstream breaches.) Dave Irving

said Ouray NWR is convinced that water inundated floodplains from the downstream end historically, so we will need to convince them of the need for upstream breaches. Pat said the data have not shown that sediment fills the sites with upstream breaches, which has been one of the Refuge's concerns. We might need a meeting between the Program and Mickey Heitmeyer and Lee Fredrickson (who wrote report for Service recommending downstream breaches). Bob Muth and others thanked Pat Nelson for a job very well done.

12. NFWF State Funds - Angela Kantola and Tom Blickensderfer referred to Rebecca Kramer's July 28, 2005, e-mail regarding the mis-calculation of state allocations of the Grand Valley project costs. Utah and Wyoming agreed to the solution Rebecca presented in option #2. Angela said Rebecca was very apologetic for the error. The Committee discussed scheduling of capital program contributions. Brent said the Program has to make full payment on Elkhead within 2 years of substantial completion of Elkhead construction.
13. Reports status - Angela Kantola distributed an updated reports list.
14. Upcoming Management Committee tasks and schedule next meeting - Tuesday, November 22 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. in Denver near DIA (preferably not at the Crystal Inn, if possible). >The Program Director's office will reserve a meeting room. Dave Mazour suggested it would be good to have a half-hour presentation on nonnative fish control at the Management Committee's first meeting in 2006. Pat Nelson said synthesis reports on the nonnative fish management projects are due in 2007. Pat noted that more native fish have been captured in the Yampa River this year. Tom Blickensderfer said Tom Nesler has been appointed as chief of CDOW's wildlife conservation section, so Colorado likely will need to appoint a new representative to the Biology Committee.

ADJOURN 1:50 p.m.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Angela Kantola will post the revised June 2, 2005 meeting summary to the listserver.
2. Environmental groups will provide more specific comments on the draft sufficient progress memo. Any additional comments should be submitted to the Service no later than August 19.
3. Management Committee members will ask their Implementation Committee members to allow the Management Committee's approval of the work plan to stand (with Committee members given until August 25 to confirm this and submit any additional comments or concerns).
4. Angela Kantola will poll Implementation Committee members via e-mail (and copy Management Committee members) for available dates the week of September 19th and 26th.
5. In late August the Biology Committee will have a conference call to discuss screening Elkhead to prevent nonnative fish escapement in 2006. Bob Muth will use the Biology's Committee input and poll the Management Committee via e-mail for a decision before September 1 on whether or not to install a temporary screen for 2006.
6. Bob Muth, Dave Campbell, and Debbie Felker will provide a revised proposal for integration of outreach activities with costs and specifics to the San Juan Coordinating Committee well in advance of their November meeting
7. Bob Muth will follow up on Rick Axthelm's request for more information regarding the recovery goals (in light of the fact that there was public participation in their development, yet they're still a subject of litigation).
8. Tom Blickensderfer will follow up with CWCB on the concern about the "ultimatum" language in scope of work #70 and ask Randy Seaholm to work with George Smith to appropriately revise and update the language.
9. George Smith will send out the scope of work for Elkhead enlargement.
10. George Smith will develop the Duchesne sediment monitoring scope of work in coordination with Terry Hickman (and also reference work being done CUWCD and the DRWG).
11. Brent Uilenberg and Angela Kantola will close the loop on the 2004 extraordinary Ruedi O&M repayment via e-mail to Brian Person.
12. The Program Director's office will discuss the easement management project with the Service and get the scope of work revised.

13. Tom Czapla will work with Vernal and Reclamation to determine if additional work on the Ouray NFH wells is needed in FY 06 (\$45K).
14. Tom Czapla has a preliminary answer on the cost of the lease of ponds from Trinidad State Junior College (which includes utilities and some tanks, as well), but will follow-up to get the complete answer.
15. Bob Muth will provide recommendations on the overall direction the Program should be taking in order to provide direction on what additional work the Program may want to fund in FY 06 and 07.
16. Angela Kantola will include a note in the e-mail transmitting this meeting summary that any overdue scopes of work need to be submitted by the end of next week.
17. Angela Kantola will incorporate the process for competition in the Program's work-planning process (which is included in Program Guidance and in the Service's Program Management scope of work).
18. The Program Director's office will arrange for a meeting room near DIA (preferably *not* at the Crystal Inn) on November 22.

Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee, Grand Junction, Colorado
August 10-11, 2005

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer	State of Colorado.
Robert King	State of Utah
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Larry Gamble for Mary Henry	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
John Reber	National Park Service
Tom Iseman	The Nature Conservancy
Gary Burton	Western Area Power Administration

Nonvoting Member:

Bob Muth	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pat Nelson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Czapla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Debbie Felker (via phone 8/11/05)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others:

Dave Campbell	San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program
Dave Irving	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Matthew Andersen	Utah Division of Wildlife
Dan Birch	Colorado River Water Conservation District
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
George Smith	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Clayton Palmer	Western Area Power Administration
Al Pfister	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Lori Martin (8/10) and Sherm Hebein (8/11) for Tom Nesler	Colorado Division of Wildlife
Terry Hickman	Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Bill Goosman	Colorado Division of Wildlife
Dave Merritt	Colorado River Water Conservation District
Ed Warner	Bureau of Reclamation
Steve McCall	Bureau of Reclamation